

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6567

to Poland's assistance. That undertaking proved the immediate *casus belli* of the greatest and most destructive war in history and the ultimate cause of Hitler's downfall and the preservation of Europe's liberty. It saved Russia by giving her a 2-years breathing space before the attack which Hitler had resolved, and long planned, to launch against her and it decided that, when that attack came, Russia's vulnerable southern flank would be guarded by the British Eastern Mediterranean Fleet and Air Forces and by the British and Commonwealth armies in the Middle East. There was no German attack from Asia Minor on the Caucasus and the vital, vulnerable Baku oilwells because Britain, armed at last after nearly 2 years of war and rearmament, stood in the way. For Hitler's reply—in the end a fatal one for him—to the British guarantee to Poland, was the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of August 1939. The pact spelt the certain destruction of Poland if it should decide to act on the British guarantee and, so Hitler supposed, the apparent defeat and fatuity of Britain's strategic resistance to Germany. But the price the would-be world conqueror had to pay for it was a reprieve for Russia. And though that reprieve was temporary, it was to prove fatal for him.

Poland chose to resist and, by resisting Hitler's atrocious designs, to be destroyed. Only a very great people would have done so under such circumstances, but the Poles, for all their political faults and failures, have proved again and again that they are a very great people. In the 17th century they saved European civilization; they did so again by this heroic sacrifice of theirs in the 20th century. For though nothing but instantaneous and annihilating defeat followed or could follow Poland's refusal to submit to Hitler's will by submitting and joining under duress, as Rumania and Hungary later joined, his eastward march against Russia—whom the Poles also feared and hated and had every cause to fear and hate—its consequences were as great as those that have followed any political act in history. It brought Britain and France into the field against Hitler at a time when Hitler had to be opposed by force of arms or be allowed to triumph over all mankind. And though within 10 months France had failed and the French Government had surrendered, the British refused to let go and in spite of all odds held grimly on, like a bulldog, at the conqueror's throat until in the fullness of time others entered the fight and made use of the respite that long, solitary bulldog grip had given them.

Yet without Poland's decision and sacrifice that bulldog grip would never have been applied at the decisive moment or, when it had been, would have been applied too late. The Poles, almost to a man, knew instinctively that Hitler must be resisted at whatever price to themselves. And we in Britain who pledged ourselves to stand by them and so gave them the hope and belief that the sacrifice that they then so heroically elected to make would not be in vain, owe them a debt of honor which we can only repay today by helping the little handful of expatriate representatives and survivors of that martyred generation now living in our midst who gave their all, not merely for the Poland they loved and which was past saving but for civilization and all that we call Christendom. The independence of Poland which, under the aegis of an all-devouring Stalin and a fatally trusting President Roosevelt, was shamefully repudiated by the victors of the crusade for human liberty in which she had been the first to take the cross of renunciation, valor and suffering, cannot be restored today except at the price of a world nuclear war. But the comfort, personal independence and human dignity of the brave Polish survivors and exiles who

fought with and for us, and, in fighting, lost all they possessed except their honor and courage, can at least be assured by the British people, both in their corporate capacity as a nation and in their personal one as individuals. And at a time when, for better or worse, we are talking, and for our own supposed advantage, 17 years after the end of the war in which Poland perished, of throwing in our economic and political lot with the nation that destroyed Poland, it seems particularly incumbent on us to do all that we can to honor that debt to these gallant men eating the bread of exile in the country that bade them have the faith to fight and which, not without their help, survived and triumphed in the struggle that engulfed them and their own land.

Of such men there are some especially to whom, acting in our individual capacity, we can bring timely and wanted help. The Polish Air Force Association in Great Britain, whose address is 14, Collingham Gardens, London, SW5, exists to render to Polish ex-airmen who fought by our side in the late war the same invaluable assistance that the RAF Benevolent Fund gives to those, and their dependents, who have served in the RAF. It provides grants and loans to those in need of assistance and who can be helped in no other way, including the disabled, sick and temporarily unemployed, and the families, widows and orphans of Polish airmen killed in action or deceased. It makes interest-free loans to those who need money to buy tools to obtain employment or to establish themselves in small businesses or workshops. It sends parcels containing materials, clothes, medical goods and food to the distressed families of Polish airmen living behind the Iron Curtain in Poland and who in many cases are suffering great privation. It gives advice and provides a meeting place and social and cultural entertainment for exiled Polish airmen in England. It does untold good with very little money, and it needs more.

When Poland's own heroic and unavailing fight against the German hordes ended in the death in battle of 80,000 and the captivity, ruin, and enslavement of millions, thousands of Polish soldiers and airmen, refusing to give up the struggle, made their way to France and ultimately to England in order to fight on. In the words of a Ministry of Information wartime publication telling the official story of the Allied Air Forces from the occupied countries, "they had skied across the Carpathians; they had been through the prisons of Hungary; they had stolen boats and had rowed down the Drava River into Yugoslavia; they had come by steamer to Marseilles. They found themselves in a France on the verge of defeat and disunity. So in June 1940 their escape began again. There was now only one country left for them—England." There they became the largest of the exiled European forces fighting against Germany and, in due course of time, played, in the desert, in Italy, and in Normandy and northwest Europe, a vital part in the defeat of Germany.

Among them were a considerable number of Polish airmen. Within a few weeks of their arrival in England there were two Polish fighter squadrons among the devoted little array that defied and defeated the Luftwaffe in the Battle of Britain. One pilot in every eight who fought for us and mankind in that immortal struggle was a Pole. One of them destroyed 25 raiders in 4 days. Altogether they brought down in the battle 200 German aircraft. Group Capt. Douglas Bader, who fought with these Polish airmen, has recalled them as "a tough, dedicated bunch who fought to save these islands as

though they were fighting over their own country. None of us," he wrote, "will ever forget them." Before the war ended there were no fewer than 14 Polish squadrons serving with the RAF.

"When the call came," Sir Winston Churchill has said, "Poland did not hesitate. . . . She showed in the spontaneous response of her sons and daughters that spirit of national unity and of self-sacrifice which has maintained her among the great nations of Europe through all her many trials and tribulations." In the words of the patron of the Polish Air Force Association, Marshal of the Royal Air Force Sir John Slessor, its sons who continued throughout the war to fight by our side, "never wavered. They started fighting before we did and only stopped when we stopped. . . . There are the widows and orphans of those dead aircrews; there are the disabled and the sick; the aging men and their dependents who naturally find it more difficult than we to live in a land which is not their own. . . . Try and imagine what it would be like if the situation were reversed. How would you like to be an exile in a strange land—a friendly land, of course, but nonetheless a foreign country—unable even to go back to England? Supposing you or your wife or child broke a leg or got pneumonia, or lost your job; wouldn't you like to feel that you had someone to turn to for help—some organization run by your own people, talking your own language—something like a branch of your Regimental Old Comrades Association or King George's Fund for Sailors or the RAF Benevolent Fund? That is what the Polish Air Force Association exists for."

Greater Insecticide Control Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much recent comment on the drug control activities of the Food and Drug Administration. Numerous articles have appeared in newspapers and in other mass mediums calling for investigation and reevaluation of the Federal functions in these areas. Yet, we are today faced with a problem of even greater significance—to both present and future generations—the problem of indiscriminate use of toxic insecticides and pesticides and their effect on urban dwellers, who, having no choice, must purchase foods ineradicably contaminated with toxic agents without any knowledge thereof. A series of three articles, commencing with the June 16, 1962, issue of the New Yorker magazine, written by Rachel Carson, noted biologist, has pointed out many aspects of this problem.

The two main problem areas of insecticide use for the urban dweller are ecological balance and toxic agents causing pollution of water supplies and foodstuffs. The history of life on earth is a history of interaction of living things and their surroundings. Nature has achieved, through eons of evolution, an ecological—environmental—balance which keeps all species of animal life in reasonable proportion to all other

¹ "There's Freedom in the Air," Ministry of Information, 1943.

A6568

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 31

species. Man, however, has recently achieved artificial means to disrupt this delicate balance through the use of insecticides. Quite often, his efforts to eliminate a certain species of insect have had disastrous results. Although the insect pest is often brought under temporary control, its natural enemy—birds, another insect, and so forth—is also often wiped out and the complex predator-prey balance is destroyed. The insect world, however, has shown surprising ability to develop resistance to insecticides and often an even greater resurgence of the insect population follows since the insect's natural enemy has been destroyed. Man is then forced to develop an even more powerful insecticide and the cycle begins anew with the usual result that the insect pest is not controlled and that widespread environmental contamination and death of animal life is produced. This has reached catastrophic proportions in many areas of the world where disease-carrying insects have reached a point of resistance to insecticides such that they have become almost ineradicable. Miss Carson suggests several means to combat this vicious cycle. The first, of course, is increased sanitation which would destroy the breeding places of many objectionable and disease-carrying insects. Second, she advocates the use of biological controls, that is, the importation and distribution of the insect's natural enemy to aid in keeping the insect population under control. She notes, for example, that the Japanese beetle has been brought under excellent control on the east coast through the use of biological controls, while Department of Agriculture efforts in the Midwest to control the beetle by extensive spraying have failed miserably.

A more serious problem is the effects widespread application of insecticides may have on present and future generations. Many insecticides in use today have proven toxic effects on humans, including DDT and its derivatives, chlorinated hydrocarbons—dieldrin, and so forth—and organic phosphates. It has been proven by experimentation that these toxic chemicals are often stored in the fatty reserves of the body and their cumulative effect may be extremely dangerous. For example, the vital enzyme functions of the cells in performing oxidation of complex sugars may be affected, causing immediate death, since the body is unable to obtain energy for vital life processes. Some insecticides have been proven to be cancer producing—carcinogens—while others are known to contribute to possible cancerous growths. Still other insecticides have been known to break down the genetic transmission functions of the cells causing hereditarily transferable defects and deformities. According to Dr. Malcolm Hargraves, of the hematology department of the Mayo Clinic, blood diseases—including leukemia—related to the use of various toxic substances have been increasing, particularly in the last 10 years. He states that:

I believe that the vast majority of patients suffering from blood dyscrasias and lymphoid diseases have a significant history of

exposure to the various hydrocarbons, which in turn include most of the pesticides of today.

Thus, we are slowly, through increased use of highly toxic insecticides and pesticides, poisoning our environment and quite possibly adversely affecting the health of our population, while the cumulative effects on the future are not yet known. Miss Carson suggests that the ultimate solution to this problem is to use chemicals that are less toxic, so that the public hazard will be much reduced. Such chemicals already exist and include the pyrethins, rotenone, ryania, and others.

One of the major solutions to the problem of insecticide control lies in a reconsideration of the laws affecting the use of toxic chemicals. It is ironic that while various branches of the Food and Drug Administration are warning of the dire results of excess use of certain insecticides, various other Federal agencies are advocating and assisting in their application. On containers of insecticides containing extremely toxic chemicals, warnings are printed so inconspicuously that few people take the trouble to read them. An industrial firm recently undertook a survey to find out just how few. The results indicated that out of a hundred people using insecticide aerosols and sprays, scarcely 15 are aware that there are any warnings at all on the containers.

The next logical question is, What protection does the Government offer us from indiscriminate insecticide use? The Food and Drug Administration establishes maximum permissible limits of contamination, called tolerances for the various pesticides. However, the efforts of the Food and Drug Administration in the field of consumer protection is severely limited by two factors. One, the Food and Drug Administration has jurisdiction only over foods marketed in interstate commerce and, two, the small number of inspectors on its staff do not allow for adequate inspection of those goods which do pass through interstate commerce. Thus, goods not shipped across State lines are subject to State laws alone, many of which are extremely inadequate or nonexistent. Furthermore, the small staff of inspectors permits only an infinitesimal fraction of the products to be inspected—far less than 1 percent—and uncounted amounts of contaminated products have reached the consumer. For example, a third of the dairy products tested in 1960 showed residues of toxic chemicals above legal limits.

Beyond the above limiting factors, the system under which the Food and Drug Administration establishes tolerances has obvious defects. Although the limits of contamination on each individual item may be legally safe, there is no control over the total cumulative amount an individual may consume. This piling up of chemicals from many different sources creates a total exposure that can not be measured. It is meaningless, therefore, to talk about the safety of any specific amount of residue. And there are other defects. Sometimes tolerances have been established on the basis of inade-

quate knowledge and later review and re-evaluation caused a reduction or withdrawal of the toxic agent. But only after the public had been exposed to admittedly dangerous levels for a period of time.

Thus, if the health of our present and future generations is to be protected, an evaluation of both present legal restrictions on insecticide use and of the necessity of employing extremely toxic insecticides themselves, is imperative. The consumer deserves protection and a guarantee that his food is not contaminated with dangerous chemicals. I urge the Members to read Miss Carson's article in full and to give serious thought to these problems.

No Action Policy of the New Frontier in Cuba Threatens Communist Expansion in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, recent confirmation by the State Department and CIA together with Presidential statements proves conclusively what has been known for some time, that Communists are in the process of a gigantic military and technical buildup in Cuba in direct contravention to the Monroe Doctrine reenunciated at Punta del Este by the Organization of American States recently.

For over 2 years as a Representative of one of the districts of Florida, that State being 90 miles from Cuba, I have been insisting upon a positive firm program to oust the Communists and Castro from Cuba and to prevent its military and technical buildup as a jumping off point for Communists in this hemisphere.

This recent influx of what the administration chooses to call Communist technicians and the importation of Red surface-to-air missiles, together with the admitted military buildup and substantial takeover by the Chinese and Russian Communists of the functions of government again emphasizes the need for and the long lack of a positive program to get rid of Castro.

Instead of such positive action and over my objections the administration has endorsed the \$62 million ransom-for-prisoners demands made by Castro in the name of indemnity for the Bay of Pigs invasion and I offered an amendment to the mutual security bill to outlaw this transaction. It barely failed passage and I might note without a Republican vote against it by 134 to 137 in a division vote. This abortive demand for dollars is in direct contradiction to the no-trade policy carried out under Eisenhower in withdrawing the sugar quota, and the followup of withdrawal of trade under President Kennedy to prevent the flow of dollars to Cuba.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6569

Representing the tobacco workers of Tampa and knowing that the lack of imported Havana tobacco has hit the tobacco-making industry hard, this sacrifice now being made by U.S. workers to prevent dollars from flowing to Cuba, it is totally unconscionable that the administration would give backing to this indemnity ransom demand, which includes a preliminary Treasury Department ruling making contributions to the exiled prisoners committee tax deductible and refusal upon interrogation of the President to repudiate this scheme to provide dollars to Communist Castro.

During the campaign, Candidate Kennedy reiterated many times his intention, if elected President, to take firm action in Cuba, including specifically the recognition of a free non-Communist government-in-exile. This has not been done to date and the Cuban refugees, who themselves, if properly unified behind an effective leader, could do more than anyone else both externally and internally to overthrow the Castro-Communist regime, for many months have been imploring the administration to take such a move so that all of the Cuban exiles and the present and prospective insurgents within Cuba would know that the United States is in support of a free non-Communist government for Cuba and would have hopes of eventual victory. The floundering around today, including the split among the Cuban refugees as to who the proper leader should be, makes this solution to the Cuban crisis most difficult.

The second step should be a declaration of policy by the United States announced to the Communist world the intention of this country to uphold the Monroe Doctrine reenunciated at Punta del Este and backed by the Organization of American States to prevent the inshipment in the future of any additional heavy war materiel in this hemisphere and specifically to Cuba and likewise to prevent the exportation from Cuba to any other hemisphere of revolutionary war materiel and/or forces. Troops were sent to South Vietnam to prevent Communist overthrow and attack from Laos, risking Russian and Red China opposition but none developed. That country is five to six thousand miles from our shores and yet there is no willingness to prevent shipment of troops and materiel into a Communist-controlled and dominated island 90 miles from our shores. This makes no sense to me or the American people. The excuse is used that the United States should not ruffle the feathers of Russia because of the Berlin situation. That did not prevent troops from being sent to South Vietnam and should not prevent firm action on Cuba. This is, in my opinion, an excuse for inaction which makes no sense.

The President should likewise enunciate the policy of the United States that Alliance for Progress funds which are already supposed to be conditioned upon land reform and other assurances should also be made available subject to further assurances that aid to, recognition of, and trade with Cuba would be withdrawn

so that that country would be isolated and to prevent the exportation of communism from Cuba.

The best information available to me, despite denials thereof by the President and the State Department, is that some 450 Communist troops recently did enter Cuba along with the other military buildup and whether or not they were in uniform seems to be nit picking and approaches an effort to mislead the American people as to what is going on in Cuba. Through failure to back up the invading refugees on the Bay of Pigs with military recommended air coverage the immediate opportunity to get rid of Castro was lost and thus the responsibility of the New Frontier. It is equally its responsibility to provide effective leadership in killing off this cancer before it spreads further or becomes a greater danger and this, in my opinion, is our duty under the Monroe Doctrine principles. A failure to provide an effective program is a sign of weakness, not only throughout the world, but in this hemisphere in particular. It is time that it be recognized that the Communists are establishing a little Russia and Red China in Cuba, 90 miles from our shore, and if this is realized then action necessarily follows. I add to my remarks a very well-reasoned column by Henry J. Taylor, which also reasons that this buildup is obviously interference in our hemisphere contrary to the Monroe Doctrine:

CUBA EMBARRASSES J.F.K.

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The heroes' shells that ricocheted across Havana Harbor into the Soviet-infested Rosita de Hornedo Hotel were the shots of liberty. This is the agonized voice of the oppressed about which we preach so much to far-off places and do nothing about in nearby Cuba.

Cuba embarrasses President Kennedy. He systematically attempts to tuck Cuba under the bed. This is human. But no greater disservice could be done to the human spirit there, to the integrity of the United States, our hemisphere and the peace of the world.

On a public relations basis, one of the administration's major objectives is to keep this horror-stricken island out of the headlines. The mold was cast immediately after the Bay of Pigs debacle. For this public relations purpose, Mr. Kennedy advanced his Vienna meeting with Khrushchev and surprised President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan by going abroad and entering into full pageantry months before he originally intended to, or should have gone.

The diversion process continues. But it still leaves our Cuba business unfinished. How long can the United States pretend nothing is happening in Cuba and turn in its gaze the other way?

Mr. Kennedy warned Castro, "The United States will not tolerate a Communist regime 90 miles from our shores." We not only tolerate it; we actually help it. First, we help it by not constantly condemning in any effective way the barbarism there.

Protocol wristslaps, yes. Wrath, no. If the steel companies could evoke such wrath from Mr. Kennedy, why cannot Cuba?

Next, we help Cuba in the United Nations. Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland recently testified before a Senate subcommittee that the State Department had diverted other funds to pay delinquencies in the U.N. for several Iron Curtain countries—including Cuba. Moreover, through the abused machinery of the U.N.'s world health organiza-

tion in Geneva, we have paid Russia for trucks and jeeps to send to Castro.

Lastly, we help Cuba mightily by having a policy that is no policy at all. Admittedly, enemy rocket sites are available there from which to reach Miami, Cape Canaveral, and even Washington (only 1,139 miles), New York (1,317), Boston (1,601), Chicago (1,333), Kansas City (1,497), Denver (1,819), Los Angeles-San Diego (2,299), and easily as far as Seattle (2,843) on a pinpoint basis.

Why does the administration consistently pooh-poo and soften the indications these rocket sites are being built? If you were Khrushchev, wouldn't you build them? Disliking the inevitable does not make it less inevitable.

We have a great U.S. naval base right on the island. Scores of Russian transports, loaded to the gunwales with "technicians" and military equipment, steam past it every week. In effect, Cuba has been invaded. If Mr. Kennedy cannot conveniently see that this is interference in our hemisphere by foreign powers, it is high time the American people forced a better policy than "let the dust settle."

Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10113) to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration, to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, because this bill cannot achieve its alleged objective, although from the point of view of the White House it is more politically desirable than legislatively prudent, I shall vote against it.

This bill purports to solve, or at least to appreciably dent, the unemployment problem. However, in testimony before the Public Works Committee which unearthed the facts only about 125,000 people could be employed for 2 years if the bill passed. This represents a scant 3 percent of the almost 4 million people unemployed as of May.

Figures listed in the committee's report further reveal that \$2,688 million of unobligated funds have not been used by the administration, so to add \$900 million more of unobligated funds would be an extravagance, especially when we are facing a \$7 to \$10 billion deficit for fiscal 1962. For this to come at a time when our national debt has exceeded the \$300 billion mark is wasteful pork-barreling. Foolish spending must cease and Congress should take the initiative.

The bill would create a czar of public works in a new agency, who would have the authority to subvert and distort defined lines of programs, already in operation, thus contributing more havoc to

A6570

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 31

an already confused administration. This new agency could wield vast power by controlling projects now under the Area Redevelopment Agency, Corps of Engineers, and Bureau of Reclamation to name only a few. Of even greater importance, this czar would have the power, now reserved to Congress, to review item by item, specific appropriations for public work projects. To abdicate this authority to an all-powerful executive would reduce Congress to a rubberstamp.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a very powerful political weapon in the hands of the executive branch. Since past behavior is indicative of future action, it will almost certainly be used as the proverbial carrot in attempts to swing reluctant Members to the administration's point of view. In the past year we felt the pressures of such lobbying, therefore, it would, in my opinion, be most unwise to increase these opportunities for the executive to carry the big stick.

This is poor legislation and it should be defeated.

Qualifications of Electors

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the States in substance existed before the Central Government. Our Federal Government is a creature of the States. The power, insuring the effective operation of each within its respective sphere, is vested in the Constitution. In the Constitution, powers are delegated to each in order to maintain a division and proper balance, with the States enjoying as inherent those powers not specifically delegated. The States, thus ultimately the people, must be allowed to preserve their constitutional rights and powers, both granted and residual.

Since the States have been guaranteed by the Constitution the privilege of deciding upon the manner and method of conducting their elections, there is no need for this amendment. It would be an imposition for the Federal Government to presume to dictate to the States how they must operate their elections. This coercion of the States by its own creation is a direct invasion of States rights.

There is no justification for this amendment as only five States now retain the poll tax as a requirement for vote. My own State of South Carolina long ago did away with the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. In the States that do require poll tax, the token remittance ranges from \$1 to \$2, the receipts in most cases being used for education and other citizen benefits. Upon the basis of this evidence, a claim of the use of poll tax as an implement of

discrimination is invalid and not worth consideration. The adoption of this amendment would, in truth, be a manifestation of the power highly organized and well-financed pressure groups can bring to bear upon the people of the United States. I believe each State should be free to make this decision with regard to the criteria for voting, being governed by the desires of its citizens.

The adoption of this amendment would have far-reaching effects, setting a dangerous precedent. It is a step toward complete Federal control of elections on the State and local levels. This is just another among the long list of incidents of the continuing centralization of the Federal Government at the expense of the State and local governments and ultimately the citizen.

This amendment would be another weight upon one side of the already unequal balance which controls the constitutional division of power. This easy amendment of our Constitution would lead to further encroachment of this one division, the Federal Government, upon the rights included in the realm of the other, the State governments. The final burden of these limitations will be borne by the people.

The powerful pressure groups and minorities forcing this unnecessary amendment through the Congress will, with its adoption, grow more bold, arrogant, and demanding. They cannot and will not cease their agitation until they establish a dictatorship over the majority or until representative government is destroyed and elections become a Federal fraud.

The States and the people at the local level have been doing a magnificent job in this field—they need to be complimented and encouraged. This amendment is not needed. It is a reflection on the fine job done by the States. It is desperately sought by the pressure groups so as to claim for themselves and the Federal Government credit for something that has already been done by the States and the people. This amendment is a fraud and a waste of the time of the Congress.

Experiment Station Research Facilities

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my support of H.R. 12712 authorizing Federal matching funds for agricultural experiment station research facilities. Agricultural research has been a significant factor in making American agriculture the most efficient and productive in the world. This legislation will promote continued progress by assuring sound financing of needed physical facilities to house this activity.

Farmers, business, and consumers

have benefited greatly from the work conducted at land-grant colleges—such as my own alma mater, Cornell University. The technical knowledge gained has led to improved quality and new uses for American food and fiber. New markets for farmers and businessmen and lower cost for consumers have resulted. It is heartening to note the widespread bipartisan interest and support of this worthy legislation.

Anniversary of Attack on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, 23 years ago, September 1, 1939, Hitler sent his Nazi legions storming into Poland, thereby precipitating the greatest holocaust in the history of mankind. Outnumbered, lacking modern equipment, stabbed in the back by Stalin, the Polish people fought with their traditional bravery until crushed by the weight of superior forces. Who can forget the siege of Warsaw, where the loudspeakers blared defiance with Chopin's "Polonaise," while the Stuka dive bombers were pounding whole sections to rubble.

Since that dimly remembered date, 23 years ago, the Polish people have enjoyed only the briefest breath of freedom. Going back on their pledges at Yalta, the Russians never permitted free elections there, and by fraud, treachery, and intimidation the Communists gained control of the country. But they have never been accepted by the people of Poland, and it is safe to say that even today, after 15 years of Communist rule, Polish hearts are with the West.

Every correspondent who files a story about Poland notes the thirst for things Western, and Poland's conviction that she is of the West. The true feelings of the Polish people for America, regardless of what their Communist masters tell them, has been abundantly demonstrated over the years.

There is a tragic lesson for us in the rape of Poland, for Nazi Germany could have been stopped in her tracks in the thirties, if the powers of Europe had been firm with Hitler when he first violated the Treaty of Versailles. Instead, the powers temporized. The result was to encourage Hitler to continue to build up his forces and defy the existing order in Europe.

Need I point out the moral? Appeasement breeds war, it is as simple as that. Yielding to the bullying and blustering of Khrushchev today would be as fatal for us as yielding to the ranting of Hitler was for the European powers in another generation. Let us never forget the lesson of Poland, and let us continue to encourage ties of friendship and understanding with the courageous Polish people. They will one day again breathe the air of freedom.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17221

that it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce after the effective date of this legislation, or (2) in such business he buys or receives any such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce after the effective date of this legislation.

3. Under the House amendment, proposed section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, would have included a subsection (g) and a subsection (h). Subsection (g) provided for the granting of immunity to persons who assert their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination with regard to the maintenance of the records required by this legislation or testifying with respect thereto before any grand jury or court of the United States.

Proposed subsection (h) would have required the Attorney General to make such regulations as might in his judgment be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of January 2, 1951, as amended by this legislation. Any violation of such a regulation would have been punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

Both subsection (g) and subsection (h) are omitted from the bill as agreed to in conference.

4. The House amendment added a new section 9 to the act of January 2, 1951. This section lists machines and devices which would be specifically exempted from the coverage of the act. Among the machines and devices specifically exempted under the language of the House amendment are so-called claw, crane, or digger machines which are not coin operated, are actuated by a crank, and designed and manufactured primarily for use at carnivals or county or State fairs. The only change made in this proposed section 9 by the bill as agreed to in conference would be to include within its scope devices similar to such claw, crane, or digger machines.

OREN HARRIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
JOHN B. BENNETT,
W. L. SPRINGER,
J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

THE EMERGENCY FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I make this request in order to read a telegram from London, England, dated August 25, 1962, addressed to the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

I would like it made known that I agree wholeheartedly that it is necessary to enact the pending legislation to provide emergency financial assistance to the United Nations. This is a measure helping to hold open the door of hope for all mankind in its yearning for a world of peace and justice among Nations. Our country has played a leading role in the development of this great forum and we must not fail it now. I urge that all thoughts of partisan or personal advantage, and our understandable disappointments that this institution like all human enterprises has not met our every expectation, be set aside and that our Members of Congress regardless of section or party responsibility unhesitatingly stand up and be counted in support of this legislation. I am sending this same message to CHARLIE HALLECK.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

No. 157—2

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LABOR DAY, 1962

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 3, we commemorate Labor Day, when all Americans regardless of class, occupation, or status, pause to honor our Nation's working men and women whose skills have produced for us a greater abundance and freedom than any nation the world has ever known. Naturally, the Nation and its people take official note of labor's great contribution to the building of America, yet in all practicality, we must reemphasize that, in effect, every day is Labor Day.

Too many Americans enjoy the long Labor Day weekend, without being mindful of its great significance; too many Americans take Labor Day for granted, without thinking about its significant meaning.

In this present period of international tensions, more than ever Labor Day is significant of the greatness of the American way of life in contrast to the tyranny of communism. In our country, labor is respected, has its legitimate union movement, is rewarded for its productivity, and individuals are encouraged to improve their skills and development. In direct contrast, labor in Communist countries is stifled, the union is a tool of the party, the workers are frustrated, regimented and enslaved.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I reemphasize the tremendous international significance of Labor Day, and want to join my colleagues in paying appropriate tribute to the working men and women of America, the creators of so much of our Nation's strength, freedom, and leadership.

SHIPPING STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO CUBA

(Mr. HARSHA (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported through various sources that some of our great friends, such as Great Britain, Norway, Greece, and Italy, are shipping Russian oil, industrial equipment, flour, paper, and fertilizer to Cuba.

If this is true, then I think it is high time our State Department reexamined its policy of giving aid and assistance to such countries.

What kind of an ally is it that will take aid and help from us and then turn right around and deliver strategic materials to Castro, our enemy? I would like an explanation from the State Department as to why we should continue to support such "friends" if this is the case.

If these allies persist in this venture I see absolutely no reason why we should continue to aid them. If we do, we are indirectly aiding Castro and I am certain the American taxpayer is not interested in that.

Before the State Department does out any more relief to these nations they should be made to stop this practice forthwith. Likewise, they should assure the United States they are not doing this or will not.

I trust the State Department will check into this matter immediately and display a little intestinal fortitude for a change.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the first of September, is the 23d anniversary of the Nazi invasion of Poland.

I have repeatedly called the attention of the House to the fact that one of the great tragedies of all history is that the Poles and other peoples of Eastern Europe, who fought the Nazi invasion of their countries did not regain their freedom after the war, but found themselves under a different form of slavery—communism. Certainly, history shows these results to be caused by the tragic, blind policies of our wartime President and his State Department.

The Polish people maintain their tremendous spirit of resistance against their Communist oppressors, and are especially mindful of the continued leadership being provided by the Polish Government in exile. I wish to place in the RECORD the message of the President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish nation on the occasion of the anniversary of the invasion of Poland, which triggered World War II:

MESSAGE OF H. E. AUGUST ZALESKI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION

When on September 1, we recall the anxious moments experienced by the Polish Nation in the year 1939, we will, without doubt, not only recall the German aggression against our homeland, but also the events which led to this tragedy for the entire world.

These events were but a long chain of appeasement in face of German aggressiveness. Without opposition, Germany went from success to success.

The victors of the First Great War watched helplessly the progress of the illegal German rearmament followed by the annexation of Austria and Czechoslovakia.

Only when Russia signed the treaty of alliance with Germany aimed at a new partition of Poland, the West realized what further appeasement might lead to. But it

17222

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 31

was already too late to prevent a new Teutonic advance without unleashing the most devastating war humanity has lived through so far.

At first, this war was fought by the Polish Nation alone, with unprecedented bravery and sacrifice, against the unified might of Germany and Russia.

Left without any assistance from their allies, the Polish Government was forced to leave Poland, entrusting the struggle on Polish territory to the resistance movement, which simultaneously with the Polish forces reformed abroad continued the war against our enemies.

This armed struggle lasted until the German attack changed Soviet Russia into an ally of our allies.

In consequence our country became submerged by the Russian armies which transformed our independent state into a satellite of Moscow. The armed resistance came to an end. But the struggle for the creed of our fathers, for the maintenance of our culture, for the regaining of freedom goes on.

This silent, stubborn and dedicated struggle continues and, with the help of God, will continue until our victory, in the same way as it went on during our previous captivity which lasted over a century.

H.R. 13042

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. SISK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill—H.R. 13042—to amend title 18, United States Code to make it unlawful to furnish transportation to certain unemployed persons and members of their families in order to cause such persons to move to another State.

We have recently been treated to the spectacle of a trafficking in human beings which ill fits the image of America as a land of equal opportunity and respect for the individual. I refer to the sending of unemployed Negro families to distant cities by certain groups of people who, by this action, have shown their contempt and disregard for individual human dignity.

I have given considerable thought to this problem and I have decided that the way to end this mockery is the passage of legislation which would make it unlawful to furnish transportation of the kind offered by some of our fellow citizens without certain safeguards. These safeguards are: a binding written contract for employment at the place of destination to commence on arrival and to continue for 6 months, or the sum of \$1,800 and funds sufficient for return to the original place of residence. Anyone violating these stipulations would be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

My bill specifies, of course, that these terms do not apply to members of a person's immediate family or other dependents.

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that this bill can in no way be construed as an effort to stop the voluntary movement of our citizens from State to State or from city to city in the search for economic opportunity. This is the right of every American regardless of his race, color, or creed. Each year many thou-

sands of Americans move to the industrial cities of the country and no one is suggesting that they stop. What I am suggesting is that this blatant attempt to use the poor and economically underprivileged as instruments of racist propaganda and agitation, be halted. We cannot but embarrass ourselves on the international scene if we stand idly by while our fellow Americans are used as pawns in a game which is beneath the dignity of our heritage.

LABOR DAY, 1962

(Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. SISK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Labor Day is the one day of the year on which we pay tribute to the cause of labor—to America's millions of working men and women who toil in the factories and on the farms, in the mines and in the mills, in the offices and in the shops, and in the stores across the land.

It is not alone for their role in our economic life that this tribute is well deserved, for what America is and what it has achieved is due in no small measure to the efforts of its wage earners and their organizations. Not only our standard of living, but our dedication to freedom and justice, and to equality, and our leadership in the free world—none of these would be, without their irrevocable commitment to freedom the world over.

The occasion of Labor Day, however, should not be a day on which we only pay tribute to past accomplishments. Just as important, if not more so, is that it should be the occasion to rededicate ourselves to labor's cause—to the simple aspiration of a better life for those who are less fortunate.

Indeed, it would be a far more joyous occasion if, on this Labor Day in 1962, we could truly say that we have adequately provided for the aged, that we have met our obligation to those of school age, or that we have truly bent every effort to provide jobs for the millions of jobless. It is to these tasks—the unfinished business of America—that we should rededicate ourselves on this day, for in the final analysis the greatness of our country, and its strength, will be measured by the well-being—not of those who have too much—but of those who have not enough.

I salute Delaware's working men and women this day and join with them and their unions in their struggle to eliminate deprivation and poverty, and to make secure everywhere freedom, justice and equality.

THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

(Mr. BREEDING (at the request of Mr. SISK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill known as the quality stabilization bill similar to or

identical with quality stabilization bills introduced by a number of my colleagues.

The principles and philosophy which underlie my sponsorship of the quality stabilization bill commend, it seems to me, its passage by the House of Representatives and its subsequent enactment into law.

In the first place, the quality stabilization measure revolves around a piece of property—industrial property, in this case. The industrial property is a brand name, or trademark—and it is property in the same sense as a patent or a copyright is industrial property. As with all property, the owner has the right to protect it from damage, impairment, or misappropriation.

The bill would give brand owners the right to protect their respective brands against damage from certain acts, such as: first, a reseller using goods identified by brand names in the furtherance of bait merchandising practices; second, a reseller selling the goods, with knowledge of the brand owner's currently established resale prices, at prices other than those currently established by the brand owner; and, third, a reseller, with intent to deceive consumers, publishing misrepresentation concerning the branded goods.

The bill recognizes that these trade practices can hurt brand names and trademarks. Furthermore, it recognizes that the brand remains the owner's—the manufacturer's property—even title to the tangible goods it identifies has passed to wholesaler or retailer. Accordingly, the brand owner should have the right to protect his property.

The second principle involved in the quality stabilization bill is equality of opportunity. The brand owner who also owns the means for distributing his brand lawfully determines what uniform price should be charged for that brand. Such a brand owner can be a chain-store; in this case, every outlet of the chain will charge the same price for the same branded article at the same time. Or it can be a manufacturer who sells house to house; in this case, every canvasser must charge the same uniform price that the manufacturer establishes. The quality stabilization bill takes the private privilege of certain brand owners to establish standard uniform prices for their respective brands; and it makes the right more public. In short, it confers this right on all brand owners, whether or not they own or control the means for distributing their respective brands.

Still another principle lies in the axiom that to have competition there must be competitors. The quality stabilization bill will give 1 to 2 million small independent retailers the opportunity to compete more effectively against giant retail aggregations and, therefore, to live as competitors. The continued bankruptcies of independent retailers in large measure results from their lack of dollars which would enable them to compete on more nearly equal terms with the giants—no matter what their trade practices.

An additional principle is the recognition that consumers are protected best